LBr 442.10.1

Dorchester,
April 1, 1900

My dear Mr Brewster,

I find that Otocoris a. praticola was a ♀. Also 1. ludovicianus was a ♂ and was shot just over the Roxbury line in Dorchester. Some time when you are at leisure I wish you would let me know what date you saw Turdus a. pallasii at So. Yarmouth. I got the date you saw Sterna antillarum but do not recollect whether or not it was the same day. Thanking you again for your kind attention Saturday I am,

Yours very truly,
Fred B. McKechnie,

66 Bird St.

McKechnie, F.B.
Apr. 1, 1900

P.S. Otocoris ~~[illegible]~~ was shot
Mar 5' '98 not '97

McKechnie - Fred B.
June 5. 1906.

Dear Mr Brewster -

I have at last succeeded in looking over Hoyle's birds and from a series of about fifty birds I have picked out four pairs as near the type of T. cupido as he has. After looking over all the birds I have come to believe that Hoyles birds are all right and simply show the variation of the species. While many of the birds will be hard to distinguish from the western bird - as a whole they average darker below and more rufous above and I believe would average smaller wing and tarsus. If this is so it seems to me the bird of the west should stand as a sub-species.

I should like to bring the birds to the museum some time if you are going to be there and at leisure.

Yours very truly
Fred B. McKechnie

85 Devonshire St.
June. 5. 1906.

85 Devonshire St.

McKechnie - Fred. B
July 18. 1906.

Dear Mr. Brewster,

I left my Yellow Rail item somewhere about the museum - I think on the table where we looked over the birds. Have you any suggestions about it for me? What you say about Preble and Ames has rather dampened my theory, which I thought was a pretty good one.

I have reread Ames' note in the Auk. and should judge that the reason it did not impress you was that he does not seem to be positive as to the identity of his bird. However the skin was preserved and I believe I have seen a positive record of it in print somewhere though I could not find it last night in a hurried search. I shall write to Ames about it, also see Brown again. I had supposed a bird egg was in the nest about three days and the presence of an egg then was fairly good breeding evidence. If you find any note will you please mail it to me

Yours sincerely
Fred B. McKechnie

July. 18. 1906 Boston.

McKechnie - Fred B.
July 31. 1906.

Dear Mr. Brewster

I enclose for your perusal another item on the Yellow Rail, and trust you will make some suggestions.

I feel more than ever doubtful about publishing it. In the first place perhaps I have laid too much stress on the Egg being found in the bird. Personally I still think the bird was going to breed almost without doubt. On the other hand I can recall instances where the presence of an Egg with shell in a bird means nothing. For instance the Egg which Doyle took from a Heath Hen shot in the autumn - and John Hardy tells me he took one from a Brant sent from Prince Edward Is. during the spring shooting, and on another occasion found a soft shelled egg in a bird from the same locality.

Again the more I think of it, it seems to me that it would be impossible for two different birds to utter the same cries regardless of season and if I accept Mr. Ames's description as a correct one what am I to say about it. Your reasons for overlooking Mr. Ames notes, seem very strong ones to me and yet if I knew Mr. Ames, let me say, if he had written down his description before reading your article, a careful and true description of what he heard, or if I knew him to be a painstaking observer then I should after all favor his solution.

Yet again I have heard neither Rail or Kincher and am perhaps not qualified to say anything about them in print.

Yours truly
Fred B. McKechnie

July. 31. 1906.

Mr Ames seems to have done some fine work and I see no reason for believing he has made a wrong statement.